

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully considered the December 20, 2005 Office Action, and the amendments above together with the comments that follow are presented in a bona fide effort to address all issues raised in that Action and thereby place this case in condition for allowance. Claims 1-11 were pending in this application. Claims 6-8 have been withdrawn from consideration pursuant to the previous election of species requirement. Claim 3 was allowed and claim 10 was indicated as allowed if recast in independent form. Claims 4-5 were indicated as allowable if recast in independent form and rewritten to overcome the stated claim objection.

In response to the Office Action dated December 20, 2005, claims 1-2 and 11 have been canceled and claims 4, 8, 9 and 10 have been amended. The dependencies of claims 4, 8, 9 and 10 have been amended to depend from allowed claim 3. Applicants submit that claims 3-5 and 8-10 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants note that claim 3 was identified by the Examiner as a generic claim in the previous election of species requirement. Since claims 6-8 depend from claim 3 and include all of the limitations of claim 3, Applicants submit that they are entitled to consideration of claims 6-8 in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.141, as noted by the Examiner in the Restriction Requirement. Because claims 6-8 all depend from claim 3 they are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 3. Moreover, claim 8 was considered by the Examiner, as evident from the claim objection and rejection of claim 8.

Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Entry of the present Amendment is respectfully solicited. It is believed that this response places this case in condition for allowance. Hence, prompt favorable reconsideration of this case is solicited.

Claims 4, 5 and 8 were objected to because of informalities. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection in view of the foregoing amendments to

claims 4, 5 and 8. Proper antecedent support exists for the term “diffuser” in claims 4, 5 and 8 since these claims have been amended to depend from claim 3.

The objection under 37 C.F.R. 1.75 is moot in view of the cancellation of claims 1 and 11.

Claims 1, 8 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated over Sarne et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,762,091). Claims 1 and 11 have been canceled and, therefore, the rejection is moot with respect to these claims. Moreover, claim 8 has been amended to depend from allowed claim 3 and, thus, the rejection is moot with respect to claim 8.

It is believed that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request an early and favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application. If there are any outstanding issues which might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner’s amendment, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants’ representative at the telephone number shown below.

10/502,301

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Brian K. Seidleck

Registration No. 51,321

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 BKS:idw
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: **March 20, 2006**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**